

November 3, 2021

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**COUNTY FISCAL LETTER NO. 21/22-28**

This letter informs counties of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-22 Family Urgent Response System (FURS) General Fund (GF) allocation. A total of \$26.3 million is available based on the Budget Act of 2021. This letter also informs counties of the FY 2020-21 FURS planning unspent GF distribution of \$26.4 million, which has been reappropriated to FY 2021-22 on a county-specific basis. Total available funds are displayed in the attachment.



**KIM JOHNSON**  
DIRECTOR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY  
**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES**  
744 P Street • Sacramento, CA 95814 • [www.cdss.ca.gov](http://www.cdss.ca.gov)



**GAVIN NEWSOM**  
GOVERNOR

November 3, 2021

COUNTY FISCAL LETTER (CFL) NO. 20/21-28

TO: ALL COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS  
ALL CHIEF PROBATION OFFICERS  
ALL INDEPENDENT LIVING PROGRAM MANAGERS  
ALL INDEPENDENT LIVING PROGRAM COORDINATORS  
ALL FOSTER CARE MANAGERS  
ALL TITLE IV-E AGREEMENT TRIBES  
ALL TRANSITIONAL HOUSING COORDINATORS  
ALL COUNTY BEHAVIORAL HEALTH DIRECTORS

SUBJECT: FISCAL YEAR 2021-22 FAMILY URGENT RESPONSE SYSTEM  
GENERAL FUND ALLOCATION

REFERENCE: [ALL COUNTY LETTER \(ACL\) NO. 20-89, DATED AUGUST 6, 2020](#)  
[ACL NO. 04-32, DATED SEPTEMBER 7, 2004](#)  
[CFL NO. 20/21-46, DATED DECEMBER 3, 2020](#)  
[CFL NO. 14/15-29, DATED OCTOBER 29, 2014](#)

This letter informs counties of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-22 Family Urgent Response System (FURS) General Fund (GF) allocation. A total of \$26.3 million GF is available based on the Final Budget Act of 2021. This letter also informs counties of the FY 2020-21 FURS unspent GF distribution of \$26.4 million, which has been reappropriated to FY 2021-22 on a county-specific basis. Total available funds are displayed in the attachment.

## **Background**

The FURS is a coordinated statewide, regional, and county-level system designed to provide collaborative and timely state-level phone-based response, as well as county-level in-home, in-person mobile response, during situations of instability for purposes of preserving the relationship of the caregiver and the child or youth. The FURS is intended to provide support to current and former foster youth as well as their caregivers. Please see [ACL No. 20-89](#) for more detailed information on the population that FURS serves. The FURS also requires county child welfare, probation, and behavioral health agencies to establish a joint county-based mobile response system, including a stabilization team to provide in-person support, as needed. The FURS builds upon the Continuum of Care Reform and the state's recent System of Care

development to assist current and former foster youth and their caregivers with trauma-informed supports intended to have multiple effects, including:

- Preventing placement disruptions and preserving the relationship between the child or youth and their caregiver;
- Preventing the need for a 911 call or law enforcement involvement and avoiding the criminalization of traumatized youth;
- Preventing psychiatric hospitalization and placement into congregate care; and
- Promoting healing as a family.

Further information regarding FURS and timelines for program implementation can be referenced in [ACL No. 20-89](#).

## **Funding**

In consultation with the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA), each county will receive \$446,305 GF and Los Angeles County will receive \$892,615 GF. Funds allocated to counties in FY 2021-22 for FURS are intended for infrastructure, start-up costs, and implementation of the county mobile response systems.

The attachment displays the allocations for counties that have chosen to collaborate with other counties to establish regional, cross-county mobile response teams as stated in their respective County Mobile Response System plans submitted to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) on November 15, 2020. For further details, please refer to [ACL No. 20-89](#).

## **FY 2020-21 Unspent Funds**

The attachment also displays the FY 2020-21 FURS GF planning reappropriation made available based on the Budget Act of 2021. Currently, the total statewide unspent GF from FY 2020-21 is \$26.4 million.

In consultation with the CWDA, five percent, or \$1.3 million GF, of the total unspent funds are held back on a county-specific basis for anticipated FY 2020-21 supplemental claims. After utilizing FY 2020-21 funds to cover FY 2020-21 expenditures, the remaining unspent \$25.1 million GF is reappropriated to the FY 2021-22 FURS allocation on a county-specific basis and not redistributed to counties with remaining uncovered expenditures. Counties will have through June 30, 2022, to expend the unspent GF. The CDSS will release the final reappropriation after the FY 2020-21 year-end closeout process.

Because budget authority restricts FY 2020-21 unspent GF from being reappropriated beyond FY 2021-22, the CDSS will utilize FY 2020-21 reappropriated funds to cover county expenditures incurred during FY 2021-22 before accessing FY 2021-22 funds

made available based on the Budget Act of 2021. Any FY 2020-21 unspent GF remaining after covering each county's FY 2021-22 expenditures will then be redistributed during the FY 2021-22 year-end closeout to maximize the use of FURS funding.

### **Claiming**

Counties are currently in the process of transitioning from use of the County Expense Claim (CEC) to use of the County Expense Claim Reporting Information System (CECRIS). For more information regarding this transition, please refer to [ACIN No. I-44-19](#). A forthcoming CFL will provide supplementary information on the implementation of CECRIS and highlight important differences between the CEC and CECRIS. In the interim, below are the Program Codes (PCs) in both the CEC and CECRIS format to claim to the FURS allocation.

The FURS allocation is tracked to Ledger 188 – Family Urgent Response System. The PCs have been established to monitor administrative costs tracked to the GF allocation. Costs exceeding each county's GF allocation are shifted to county share. At year-end, a closeout process based on FY 2021-22 final expenditures compares each county's total allocation, inclusive of FY 2020-21 reappropriated funds, against their expenditures. County-specific surplus balances will be redistributed to counties with deficit balances to reduce the county-only portion of the nonfederal share of costs and maximize the use of GF dollars.

The following PCs have been established for counties to claim administrative costs associated with FURS to the CECRIS:

- PC 985/0985 – FURS Protocol and Development
- PC 994/0994 – FURS Mobile Response

The PC 985/0985 (FURS Protocol and Development) is used to claim time spent on the development and administration of the FURS program. The PC 994/0994 (FURS Mobile Response) is also provided for caseworkers to claim allowable time and costs for participating on the FURS mobile response team. Costs claimed in excess of the FURS GF allocation will be shifted to and funded with 100 percent county funds using State Use Only (SUO) code 986/0986 – SUO FURS Overmatch. As mentioned above, a year-end closeout process will redistribute surplus funds to counties with deficit balances. Please refer to Attachment I of [CFL No. 20/21-46](#) for further claiming information.

Although CWDs are the recipients of the FURS state allocation, the law requires child welfare, probation departments, and county behavioral/mental health agencies to jointly develop plans and implement local mobile response teams. As such, CWDs are encouraged to allocate resources locally that align with their local plans. Additionally,

counties should reference [CFL No. 14/15-29](#) for probation departments, and [ACL No. 04-32](#) for other public agencies, regarding establishing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) needed for the pass-through of any Title IV-E funds to the extent that FURS activities are eligible for Title IV-E reimbursement.

To the extent that implementation of FURS has an overall effect of increasing certain costs already borne by a local agency for programs or levels of service mandated by the 2011 Realignment Legislation within the meaning of Section 36 of Article XIII of the California Constitution, it shall apply to local agencies only to the extent that the state provides annual funding for the cost increase. Any new program or higher level of service provided by a local agency for FURS implementation above the level for which funding has been provided shall not require a subvention of funds by the state or otherwise be subject to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.

For program-related questions regarding FURS, please contact the Placement Services and Support Unit at (916) 657-1858, or by emailing [FURS@dss.ca.gov](mailto:FURS@dss.ca.gov). Questions regarding the allocation and claiming instructions should be directed to [fiscal.systems@dss.ca.gov](mailto:fiscal.systems@dss.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

***Original Document Signed By:***

KIRA YOUNGER, Chief  
Fiscal Forecasting and Policy Branch  
Administration Division

Attachment

**FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2021-22 FAMILY URGENT RESPONSE SYSTEM  
GENERAL FUND FINAL ALLOCATION**

COUNTY	FY 2021-22 ALLOCATION	REGIONALIZED COUNTIES	FY 2020-21 PLANNING UNSPENT FUNDS	TOTAL ALLOCATION
Alameda	\$446,305	\$0	\$455,146	\$901,451
Alpine <sup>1</sup>	\$446,305	(\$446,305)	\$455,146	\$455,146
Amador	\$446,305	\$0	\$454,008	\$900,313
Butte <sup>3</sup>	\$446,305	(\$446,305)	\$455,146	\$455,146
Calaveras	\$446,305	\$0	\$424,407	\$870,712
Colusa	\$446,305	\$0	\$453,124	\$899,429
Contra Costa	\$446,305	\$0	\$449,780	\$896,085
Del Norte	\$446,305	\$0	\$455,146	\$901,451
El Dorado <sup>1</sup>	\$446,305	\$446,305	\$442,684	\$1,335,294
Fresno	\$446,305	\$0	\$454,040	\$900,345
Glenn	\$446,305	\$0	\$434,786	\$881,091
Humboldt	\$446,305	\$0	\$434,589	\$880,894
Imperial	\$446,305	\$0	\$442,898	\$889,203
Inyo	\$446,305	\$0	\$401,480	\$847,785
Kern	\$446,305	\$0	\$446,987	\$893,292
Kings	\$446,305	\$0	\$445,042	\$891,347
Lake	\$446,305	\$0	\$447,861	\$894,166
Lassen	\$446,305	\$0	\$453,079	\$899,384
Los Angeles	\$892,615	\$0	\$864,758	\$1,757,373
Madera	\$446,305	\$0	\$386,596	\$832,901
Marin <sup>2</sup>	\$446,305	(\$446,305)	\$451,385	\$451,385
Mariposa	\$446,305	\$0	\$454,935	\$901,240
Mendocino	\$446,305	\$0	\$442,253	\$888,558
Merced	\$446,305	\$0	\$446,680	\$892,985
Modoc	\$446,305	\$0	\$454,976	\$901,281
Mono	\$446,305	\$0	\$448,247	\$894,552
Monterey	\$446,305	\$0	\$455,146	\$901,451
Napa	\$446,305	\$0	\$447,765	\$894,070
Nevada	\$446,305	\$0	\$446,591	\$892,896
Orange	\$446,305	\$0	\$344,254	\$790,559
Placer	\$446,305	\$0	\$385,494	\$831,799
Plumas	\$446,305	\$0	\$455,146	\$901,451
Riverside	\$446,305	\$0	\$368,305	\$814,610
Sacramento	\$446,305	\$0	\$451,665	\$897,970
San Benito	\$446,305	\$0	\$453,184	\$899,489
San Bernardino	\$446,305	\$0	\$455,146	\$901,451
San Diego	\$446,305	\$0	\$453,686	\$899,991
San Francisco	\$446,305	\$0	\$154,471	\$600,776
San Joaquin	\$446,305	\$0	\$423,634	\$869,939
San Luis Obispo	\$446,305	\$0	\$444,573	\$890,878
San Mateo	\$446,305	\$0	\$290,991	\$737,296
Santa Barbara	\$446,305	\$0	\$455,146	\$901,451
Santa Clara	\$446,305	\$0	\$455,146	\$901,451
Santa Cruz	\$446,305	\$0	\$450,071	\$896,376
Shasta	\$446,305	\$0	\$429,144	\$875,449
Sierra	\$446,305	\$0	\$454,854	\$901,159
Siskiyou	\$446,305	\$0	\$443,583	\$889,888
Solano	\$446,305	\$0	\$430,086	\$876,391
Sonoma <sup>2</sup>	\$446,305	\$446,305	\$416,603	\$1,309,213
Stanislaus	\$446,305	\$0	\$455,146	\$901,451
Sutter <sup>3</sup>	\$446,305	\$892,610	\$401,158	\$1,740,073
Tehama	\$446,305	\$0	\$454,981	\$901,286
Trinity	\$446,305	\$0	\$455,146	\$901,451
Tulare	\$446,305	\$0	\$455,146	\$901,451
Tuolumne	\$446,305	\$0	\$48,558	\$494,863
Ventura	\$446,305	\$0	\$453,337	\$899,642
Yolo	\$446,305	\$0	\$418,117	\$864,422
Yuba <sup>3</sup>	\$446,305	(\$446,305)	\$455,146	\$455,146
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$26,332,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$25,116,598</b>	<b>\$51,448,598</b>

<sup>1</sup>Alpine and El Dorado counties have chose to regionalize. El Dorado is the lead county.

<sup>2</sup>Marin and Sonoma counties have chosen to regionalize. Sonoma is the lead county.

<sup>3</sup>Butte, Sutter and Yuba counties have chosen to regionalize. Sutter is the lead county.